

REMARKS

I. References for Consideration

Applicant acknowledges the Examiner's discussion relative to references under consideration for the examination of the instant patent application. Under separate paper mailed October 1, 2003 Applicant submitted an Information Disclosure Statement with the accompanying PTO-1449 form.

II. Objections to the drawings

The drawings are objected to because the figures are too dark, making it difficult to see the details in the figures. The Examiner further suggests the use of graphical symbols for metal and plastic, and notes that reference character 1 is not shown in Figure 3.

Applicant appreciates the careful review and attention given by the Examiner to the informal drawings of record in this case. Applicant has recently received formal drawings prepared by a qualified draftsperson, and has attached these formal drawings to this paper as proposed drawing corrections for the Examiner's review and approval. In these proposed formal drawings matters pertaining to the darkness of the figures and depictions of metal and plastic have been addressed.

Upon careful consideration of Figure 3 in view of the specification, Applicant has determined that the reference character 3 should actually have been labeled as reference character 1. This is consistent with the description in the case generally at page 4, line 20 through page 6, line 4 (including discussions of various designs of the main member 1). Applicant has therefore made this change, and regrets any confusion earlier caused by this apparent mislabeling. To effect this change Applicant has submitted herewith a corrected, redlined informal drawing together with the as-corrected formal drawing, again for the Examiner's review and approval.

In anticipation that the formal drawings are suitable for entry into the case, and given the small number of changes, Applicant has submitted concurrently herewith the formal drawings to the Drawing Review Branch. Should the Examiner see need for further changes to these drawings Applicant would be pleased to take further corrective action.

III. Claim Objections

The Examiner objected to select claims because of informalities. Specifically dependent Claims 5 and 6 have been objected to as being improper dependent claims because the preamble of these claims state an article and a front end module, respectively, while claim 1 (from which these claims depend) states an integral structure.

Applicant appreciates the careful reading of the claims by the Examiner. In response thereto, Applicants have rewritten Claim 5 as an independent claim (incorporating the limitations of Claim 1) and have also rewritten claim 6 to depend from claim 5.

IV. The Rejection of Claims 1, 2, and 4-6 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b)

Claims 1, 2, and 4-6 have been rejected as anticipated by U.S. 5,190,803 to Goldbach et al. However, Goldbach et al. disclose a structural component in which plastic reinforcing ribs "are connected to a shell at discrete connecting points via perforation in the shell through which plastic passes, extending beyond the surfaces of the perforations" (col. 1, lines 32-36). Goldbach et al. do not disclose securing a plastic support member to a metal surface using an undulating or serrated pattern or a bend or curve or securing a rib support to a metal surface with a lip, as presently claimed (and in amended form). Support for the amendments to claim 1 can be found at page 4, lines 24-31 and at page 5, lines 25-29 of the specification.

V. Indication of Allowable Subject Matter

Applicant appreciates the indication of allowability of Claim 3; and asks for reconsideration of all claims in view of the amendments to the claims and the remarks herein.

In view of the foregoing, allowance of the above-referenced application is respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted,



WILLIAM H. HAMBY
ATTORNEY FOR APPLICANT
Registration No.: 31,521
Telephone: (302) 992-3230
Facsimile: (302) 992-3257

Dated:  15, 2004

THIS PAGE BLANK (USPTO)